FUNNY WORLD

1

Prepared for the October 1966 mailing of CAPA-alpha by Mike Barrier, 5813 Hawthorne Road, Little Rock, Arkansas 72207.

* *

COVERING MY TRACKS

It occurred to me as I was preparing this contribution that this would be my fourth appearance in K-a, and yet the contribution would be titled ARKANSAS MAGAZINE & COMICS #63. That suddenly seemed a little screwy. So, abandoning sentiment, I'm starting over again--hence FUNNY WORLD #1. Since my first three contributions were eminently forgettable in most respects, and since this is to be my first mimeographed contribution, calling this #1, instead of #5, seems appropriate.

There was a comic book called FUNNY WORLD, by the way, although I know nothing more about it than that it existed, probably briefly, and probably as one of the multitude of rotten funny-animal comic books spawned in the early Forties by the success of LOONEY TUNES. The more immediate source of the title is, of course, Richard Kyle's late, lamented WONDERWORLD. Not that I'm going to try to emulate Kyle, except in the most general way; I just dug the title of his 'zine.

Before going any further--an apology for the rotten reproduction of my last contribution. My Ditto machine has been among the Living Dead for many, many years, but this past spring it finally passed the point of no return. Rather than watch it collapse into a quivering pile of junk metal the next time I tried to use it, I'm switching to mimeo. I'm not at all sure that the reproduction this time will be a lot better, since I'm not used to cutting stencils, but at least the odds aren't as hopeless as they would have been had I stuck with Ditto.

One thing especially annoyed me: that upside-down want list on the last page of my contribution. I discovered that things were topsy-turvy halfway through the run for that page, but my machine firmly refused to produce an extra 30 copies to make up for the gaffe. There were enough correct copies for all the current members, but evidently Jerry didn't use them first; in any event, my copy had an upside-down page. The same was true of most other members' copies, I would imagine, and with the poor reproduction throughout, and with that last page, my contribution must have had an overwhelmingly sloppy appearance.

AN EDITORIAL OF SORTS

K-a is at a kind of crossroads, everyone seems to feel, and I agree, especially when I consider our shrinking membership. I'm strongly in favor of reducing the maximum membership--but why just to 40? Since we have only about 20 members now, why not lower the maximum to 35, or even 30? We do need a waiting list, or at the least, we need a membership so nearly full that prospective members think twice about waiting to join, and current members are more meticulous than they are now about contributing on a regular schedule. If we filled our membership, and then decided that we could accomodate more people without difficulty, fine, but that's hardly our problem now. Then too, isn't there something a little silly about printing two extra copies of every contribution for each copy that actually goes to a current member?

Rating our contributions is a grand idea; Richard Kyle's wisdom on this point has been amply proved, I think. We now have something to look forward to in each issue that should interest us even more than mailing comments. One quibble, though, Thompsons: why restrict ratings to the top three? We should be asked to rate everything in an issue--or to leave a contribution unrated only as the ultimate in disapproval. And point totals should be published so we can tell just how strongly a contribution was liked or disliked. If a contribution was rated #1 by a wide margin, we should know it; by the same token, we should know if #3 and #8, say, were separated by only a few points. This last issue was a case in point. Selecting the top two contributions was a simple matter, but the others were so evenly matched that I might well have picked another #3 if I had thought about it longer. If other members had similar feelings, then the point totals for most contributions in #23 would have been bunched--something that won't show, since just the rankings will be published. And if we just rate the top three, then the unanimous choice for fourth, or fifth, or whatever, might turn up in last place, instead--hardly an accurate reflection of our feelings. In sum, let's keep the rating system, by all means, but let's make it more useful by (1) rating everything in the issue, and (2) publishing point totals as well as rankings.

I vote too for the title Official Editor, over Central Mailer. "Editor," to me, implies more control over content than "mailer," and that's all to the good. The Thompsons will be rather more tolerant than I would be, probably, no matter what their title, but the "editor" title is a broader license to be intolerant when the occasion demands.

And let's have our elections around the first of the year, when things are less likely to be as unsettled as they are during the holidays and in the summer.

The mailing comments/meaty articles controversies are a little more complicated--and there's a relationship between them that no one seems to have noticed. If our contributions don't contain anything of substance, what is there to say about them in our mailing comments? If our mailing comments degenerate to the slap-on-the back, your-last-issue-was-great level of most of the letters in most of the fanzines, then they're worse than useless. And if generalized approval is the only appropriate response to most K-a contributions--and it is now--then K-a itself is a waste of time. Al Kuhfeld's point--that material of substance can be presented in bits and pieces, rather than in one large, indigestible lump--is excellent, but let's go a step further. When you say, "meaty article," you think of something that appears in COMIC ART, ALTER EGO, or a similar fanzine. K-a doesn't need polished, finished articles of the sort we hope to find in those 'zines (and sometimes do). But why not "dry-run" such articles in K-a? Why not expose meaty articles to the comments and criticisms of a small, knowledgeable group of fans before casting them out before fandom at large? Our group is too small at present--and our knowledgeability quotient is certainly not as high as it should be (and was, not too long ago)--but there's still much to be said for making K-a a sort of work-in-progress 'zine. Our comments on the quality of the research, writing, and organization of an article or index might do much to improve it, if the writer carefully considers our advice. Note I say "index," too. I wince when I think of the multitude of small errors in the Disney Index I published in K-a last fall, but I'm glad to have them corrected now, before I publish that index in a larger-circulation 'zine, whether my own or someone else's.

If K-a is filled with trial runs for articles for other, more "permanent" magazines, won't we attract more people worth having, i.e., people who write such articles? We'd attract some parasites, too, but if we're alert they won't be around for long. In any event, I'm going to take my own advice from now on, and dry-run my FANTASY ILLUSTRATED columns in FUNNY WORLD before committing them to the offset printer. Even if I don't draw any criticism I consider worth heeding, there is much to be said for seeing your pet project in cold clear print as an incentive to improvements. For example, there are a number of things I would have changed in my first FI column if I had seen it staring back at me from the pages of K-a, instead of just from my typewriter, and then from FANTASY ILLUSTRATED.

The changes you make after reducing your article to print may be more important than mere touch-ups, too. Take my "Mary Jane & Sniffles" spoof in K-a #20, for example. As originally conceived, that article was a heavy-handed parody of those ponderous articles that analyze with the utmost seriousness the "powers" of Dr. Fate, or Superman, or some other super-doer. It was after re-reading the MJ&S article that I decided to re-write and expand it into the prototype for a whole series of articles on the funny-animal characters, cast in the "All in Color for a Dime" mold. "Biographies" of the funny animals, in other words, told with the proper combination of affection and detatchment. Told by an adult dealing with children's literature as children's literature, to quote Richard Lupoff. That's precisely the treatment most of the funny animals deserve. That's precisely the treatment most comic books deserve, if you haven't noticed. Where this series of articles will run is yet another question--COMIC ART, perhaps (the Thompsons like the idea) or perhaps a 'zine of my own. That super-duper, ultra-ultra, quarterly offset 'zine I talked about in FANTASY ILLUSTRATED was a juvenile pipe dream, but a more modest 'zine--cast along the lines of COMIC ART, and seeking the same sort of readership--might not be. We shall see.

"HELLO THERE, BOYS AND GIRLS" REVISITED

Some of the response to my "Mary Jane & Sniffles" article in K-a #20 disturbed me. Al Kuhfeld writes and remarks that he never could like the funny animals, "Carl Barks, Mary Jane & Sniffles, and the Phantom Blot of the Forties notwithstanding." Steve Kelez describes my spoof as an "excellent essay." Other people make remarks of equivalent ambiguity. This disturbs me because some of you seem to have the idea that I really dig "Mary Jane & Sniffles," that I think it was a great strip that should be revived with true "Golden Age" fanfare, and that there is nothing I would rather do than curl up in front of the fire with a pile of vintage issues of LOONEY TUNES at my side and pass the long winter's night devouring those great adventures in the Land of the Be-Bops. No. Not hardly. "Mary Jane & Sniffles" wasn't a great strip. It wasn't even a good strip, most of the time. An adult--or anyone over 13--who comes to the strip fresh, without fond memories of reading it as a child, and really likes it, has got to be a little cracked. Writing about it is fun--reading about it can be fun--but actually reading the strip itself, for pleasure, is rarely a pleasant experience. It's rarely unpleasant, either, but there are lots of better things to do. There are some funny-animal comic books that repay re-reading and there are even some that I re-read almost constantly, both for the great pleasure they give me and (as an amateur artist) for the instruction they provide. As for the vast majority of the funny-animal comic books in my collection, I turn to them to reawaken memories or for some other special reason--such as writing articles about them.

The "Mary Jane & Sniffles" business played a small part in some broader thinking I've done on the subject of the comic books and their fans. So did Richard Lupoff's article in COMIC ART #6, which prompted me to re-read his "Hello There, Boys and Girls" in CA #5. Lupoff is, it seems, one of those unfortunate people whose every word is instantly offensive to somebody. This is a great pity--because when he says comics fandom is a "sick and sorry development," he's right. Right for the wrong reason, though. The real problem with comics fandom isn't adults who behave like children; it's adults who deceive themselves by thinking that children's attitudes toward comic books are the same as their own.

It's great that kids read comic books, and the more the better. My own comic-book memories are precious, and old comic books have served me as a unique doorway into the past, since I frequently can remember the precise circumstances under which I bought or read a particular comic book. The comics meant a great deal to me, and I wouldn't deprive any child of a similar experience. But it's precisely because I remember my childhood attitude so well that I realize that it has very little in common with my adult attitude toward the comics. When I was a kid, the comics meant both too much and too little to me, and it took abandoning them for a few years before I could properly sort out my feelings about them. I no longer have to have them, in Feiffer-fashion, but my understanding and appreciation of the best of them has deepened immeasurably. Most adults have somewhat similar feelings, I think. It's no coincidence that the adult fans Lupoff derides for their interest in the current comics are interested not in B*A*C*T*E*R*I*A B*O*Y's debut in ADVENTURE COMICS, but in the revival or revamping of the favorite heroes of their childhoods. Neither is it a coincidence that the fans who really believe Comic Books Are Literature are teenagers--fans who have emerged from the comic-book-reading stage but aren't far enough removed from it to view comic books in their true perspective. These are the saddest cases, and they form the most devastating indictment of fandom. At their worst, some teenagers, and even some young adults, do indeed approach the comic books with all the witless enthusiasm of a 10-year-old. There don't seem to be too many of this type--yet--but there will be more, I'm sure, if fandom continues in its present course. By pretending that these people are really interested in the comics, in the same way we are, we prolong their unnatural dependence on the comics and so actually harm them.

Far more prevalent, though, are those uncomfortable young fans who try to gild their still essentially childish interest in the comics with learned discussions of Hawkman-as-hero, or the superiority of Ditko to Romita, or some similar topic, most often mirroring muddy thinking in muddy prose. For most of these unhappy young fans, the vital element lacking is a set of standards that only age and experience can provide. Thrown in with such company, somewhat older fans capable of better things frequently waste their time in tortured demonstrations of their intellectual respectability. Richard Weingroff's essay on Superman (SLAM-BANG #5) is perhaps the most strking example. Perhaps Weingroff, like the vast majority of teen-age fans, should lock his collection in a trunk and ignore the comics for a few years. Many teenage fans, I'm sure, would never return to fandom after such a sabbatical, and those who did would benefit from the experience. I know I did.

The confusion among older fans about who likes comics for what reasons is demonstrated in strange ways, sometimes. Take Bill Spicer's FANTASY ILLUSTRATED #6, for example. The cover, for all that it's Burroughs-derived, seems to me in questionable taste. It looks like the embodiment of those pre-adolescent fantasies everyone had at one time or another when looking at the cover of a comic book produced by one of the more bosom-conscious companies--Fox, or Fiction House, say. You know how it went--"If I was that mad scientist/green glob/fanged Chicom and I had that girl strapped down like that, I'd take off her clothes and stare at her." Beyond that, though, how many mothers of younger comics fans would allow the magazine in the house, once they caught a glimpse of that cover? More than in my day, certainly, but probably not a majority. And yet Bill likes the idea of expanding fandom through advertisements in the Marvel comics--and what could that do but lower the average age of comics fans?

Perhaps comics fandom's greatest mistake was in expanding vertically down to the teens and pre-teens, instead of horizontally, to the science-fiction fans, the Burroughs fans, the fantasy fans--the people who once made up Lupoff's One Big Fandom, in other words. As it is, the number of adult fanzines, and adult fans, doesn't seem to have increased appreciably over the past few years. But juding by the contents of THE ROCKET'S BLAST, an awful lot of younger fans have entered the fold. Their presence will probably make it even harder for the better fanzines like FANTASY ILLUSTRATED to gain acceptance--and badly needed subscribers--among those fans whose interest in the comics is genuine, but peripheral to some other interest. A fandom centered on young fans, with their rapidly shifting enthusiasms, and their susceptibility to parental pressure, is strictly limited in its potential. A fandom centered on adults could eventually put the lie to Lupoff's criticisms, by emphasizing those comic strips/books that are indeed art, or literature, or whatever tag you want to apply, and perhaps even by producing strips of comparable quality.

THE KEY TO GOLD KEY'S CODE NUMBERS

The Thompsons have completed their Four Color list; now it's time to move on to a listing of the Gold Key code numbers. You know, those enigmatic digits in the upper left-hand corner of the cover of each GK comic, under the trademark. Gold Key assigns each distinct title in its line--whether a monthly or a movie one-shot--a code number which remains unchanged for the life of the comic. Twelve-cent comics are assigned code numbers in 10000 series, 25¢ titles are assigned code numbers in the 30000 series. For example: DOCTOR SOLAR's code number is 10000; TARZAN's code number is 10012; PORKY PIG's code number is 10140; the code number for the TUROK giant published this summer is 30031; and so forth. Code numbers are assigned in very rough chronological order. DOCTOR SOLAR, one of the first GK titles, began publication in the summer of 1962, for example, while the first issue of PORKY PIG was published in late 1964. So, PORKY PIG has a higher code number. The 12¢ code numbers have now reached 10196 (although the titles assigned to some lower numbers haven't been published yet, probably).

To complicate matters, some GK titles were published as 25¢ comics for a while in 1962, and then cut back to 12¢ size. When this happened, code numbers were changed as well. BUGS BUNNY, which had code number 30000 as a 25¢ comic book, was assigned code number 10070 as a 12¢ comic book.

Although the code number remains unchanged throughout the life of a title (assuming its price remains the same), the code date does not. The code date is separated from the code number by a dash, and it works this way: the first of the three digits represents the last digit of the year, and the last two digits represent the month. For example, "511" is November 1965---and "10012-511" would be TARZAN for November 1965. The code date corresponds with the cover date, when there is one. Where there is no cover date, the code date is the same as that of the quarterlies published in that month. Gold Key's quarterlies and bi-monthlies bear the date when the next issue is to go on sale (monthlies are dated as if they were bi-monthlies). In other words, a bi-monthly appearing in April will be dated June, and a quarterly will be dated July. Issues without a cover date will also be code-dated July. To complicate matters, in Gold Key's first year of independent existence all bi-monthlies were dated as if they were quarterlies.

Now that you're all hopelessly repelled by this explanation of the Gold Key system, let me ask your help. I'm trying to complete my list of the GK titles, and the code dates of their first issues. For example, here's how my list looks for the start of the 10000 series, and for the most recent entries:

10000 series

0. DOCTOR SOLAR (210)
1. KING LEONARDO AND HIS SHORT SUBJECTS (210)
2. CHECKMATE (210)

.....

192. DOC SAVAGE (611)
193. THE FIGHTING PRINCE OF DONEGAL (701)
194. (BLANK)
195. IT'S ABOUT TIME (701)
196. LAUREL AND HARDY (701)

.....There are still some numbers I haven't matched with titles and code dates. I need the titles and first-issue code dates for these numbers in the 10000 (12¢) series: 10034, 10103, 10105, 10125, 10154, 10167, 10173, 10178, 10181, 10185, 10188, 10194, 10197 on.

And I also need the titles and first-issue code dates for these numbers in the 30000 (25¢) series: 30015, 30021, 20032 on.

Can anyone help?

MAILING COMMENTS

GARY MASON: Welcome to the club. The first issue of BRAMSTON is impressive--which is not quite the same as "interesting," I'm afraid. Significantly, the most interesting portions of your contribution deal with your own experiences with the censors. As for the rest of it, its relevance for comics fans is a bit far removed. Your next three installments, dealing with the censorship of the comics, should be far more interesting, and much more to the point. Your most effective approach, I think, would have been to have focused your article on the censorship of the comics from the very beginning, referring to the history of censorship-in-general only when necessary to illuminate some complicated question, or to place Australian censorship of the comics in context. The first issue of BRAMSTON was supposed to help us understand the succeeding installments, I'm sure, but it does so only in a limited, term-paper sense. I would guess,that in your second issue you'll refer to points covered in the first installment, and then we'll either have to check back to see what you said, or just muddle through. I, for one, will follow the latter course. It would have been much better, I think, if you had broken up your first BRAMSTON into bits and pieces and inserted them in the later installments where they would shed the most light on whatever you're discussing at the time. As it is, BRAMSTON #1 is more than a little dull, and the obvious work you've put into it has largely gone to waste.

One of the most interesting parts of your contribution, to me, was your remark about DC's subscription rates. Obviously, the way things are going at my grocery store, some rise in the price of comics is inevitable, soon. The problem with a 3¢ price increase is that it will be a 4¢ increase for many kids, because so many states impose a sales tax on comic books. This is something Dell must not have taken into account when they raised their prices in 1961. When faced with a six-cent price differential, it's little wonder that most kids turned to those comics still selling at 10¢, and let whatever loyalty they felt to Dell die with few regrets. The wave of the future, it seems clear now, is the 25¢, 64-page comic book. Watching the transition should be interesting, especially its effects on DC and Gold Key, who rely on 12¢ titles, and whose giants are thick and infrequent.

THE WARNER BROS. CARTOONS COMIC BOOKS, 1941-1966: INTRODUCTION

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the appearance of the first issue of LOONEY TUNES, which was, so far as I've been able to determine, the first comic book devoted to the Leon Schlesinger/Warner Bros. Cartoons characters. I'm not sure whether or not individual strips featuring these characters appeared in other comic books before the summer of 1941, when LOONEY TUNES #1 was published. There evidently were short Walter Lantz "Oswald the Rabbit" strips in some early comic books in the late Thirties, and it doesn't seem improbable that the same could be true of Porky Pig or some other Schlesinger character. Not infrequently in the early Forties, Dell would proclaim on the covers of its new funny-animal comic books, "First Time In Comics!" That way, you know that the MGM funny animals and Uncle Wiggily began their comic-book careers in OUR GANG #1 and ANIMAL COMICS #2, respectively. There's no indication on the cover of LOONEY TUNES #1 that the appearance of the Schlesinger characters in a comic book is a similarly epic event. If anyone does know of any earlier appearances of the Schlesinger characters, please let me know.

In my "editorial," I urge the use of K-a for "dry runs" for both articles and indexes, and this index--or "publishing history," to be more precise, since it isn't an index to features--is intended as evidence that I practice what I preach. In a sense, it's not a "dry run" at all, since it's complete and accurate within the limits I've set for myself. There are none of the niggling errors here that marred the Disney Index I published last fall. But what this is, is a "dry run" for a much more detailed and complete index, which I may not publish for years. It's a skeleton, in other words, to be fleshed out in the future with an index to features, code dates, cover features, some information about artists and writers, the works. Such an index would cover odds and ends like the Warner Bros. Cartoons issues of the MARCH OF COMICS, COMIC ALBUM, and OMAR SUPER-BOOK OF COMICS, and even the one-page "Bugs and Elmer" strip in the first issue of NEW FUNNIES. Such things don't belong in a simplified and limited index like this one, which covers only regular, newsstand titles devoted to the Warner Bros. characters.

This index, then, is as much or more for my benefit as it is for yours. It organizes the information I have now, and shows me where I want to go next. It also serves as a guide for organizing my collection. If it's of some interest to you, too, so much the better.

Here's how I've organized this index: first, I've dealt with Dell and Gold Key issues separately, since the Dell/Western split produced so many changes, with old titles dropped or their formats radically altered, and a number of new titles introduced. Numbering systems differ, with the Gold Key code-number system (explained on page 6) replacing the Four Color series in a limited sense. Then too, a number of Dell titles (PORKY PIG, for example) were dropped and then revived by GK, with numbering starting with #1.

Within the Dell section, the comics are split up into three different categories: comics published regularly (monthly, bi-monthly, quarterly); comics published only as Four Colors; and giants. Within each category, the titles are listed in chronological order. For the regularly-published comics, the crucial consideration is when both regular publication and sequential numbering began. LOONEY TUNES is first, of course, since it began regular publication with its second issue, in 1941; PORKY PIG is second, because sequential numbering began with #25, in 1952 (although regular, bi-monthly publication within the Four Color series began in 1951), and so on. Within the Four Color section, chronological order is the rule, period, and ditto for the giants.

The Gold Keys are arranged in numerical order, the "numerical" here referring to their code numbers. Because Gold Key's dating is rather confusing, I've listed the dates of all issues of each comic for each year, rather than following the procedure used in listing the Dells. When a Gold Key date is in parentheses--(February), for example--that means the date is a code date, from the front cover, and the comic was not actually dated.

In my Disney Index, which covered only regularly-published Dell issues, most of my errors were concentrated in the section devoted to the giants (a more accurate title for 25¢ comics than "annuals"), especially their code dates. So, to avoid such errors, I've simply not listed any code dates for the giants in this index, even though I'm more sure of them here than I was with the Disneys. Listing just the year is consistent with the limited purposes of this index, and it's also consistent with my not listing code dates for the Four Colors. All that will come later, perhaps.

An error--a deliberate one--is my listing of the title of LOONEY TUNES as "LOONEY TUNES & MERRIE MELODIES COMICS" for the first 107 issues. Actually, several of the early issues left off the "COMICS" in the title as published in the indicia at the bottom of the inside front cover (although "COMICS" was always part of the title on the cover). So really, to be perfectly accurate, I should indicate which issues were just "LOONEY TUNES & MERRIE MELODIES" and which were "LOONEY TUNES & MERRIE MELODIES COMICS." But I don't have LOONEY TUNES #4 and #5, so I'm not sure of their full titles, and again, this sort of scrupulous accuracy seems pointless in a capsule index. When and if I publish that extremely detailed index, you can be sure that it will register even such inconsequential title changes.

I hope my explanation of the organization of my data answers any and all questions you might have had if you had come upon this index "cold." And I hope too that my organization of my data strikes you as sensible. If not, please tell me. That's the point of "dry runs," after all--to spot and correct errors, and to make any other desirable changes.

THE WARNER BROS. CARTOONS COMIC BOOKS, 1941-1966

I. DELL COMICS

A. Regularly published titles (monthlies, bi-monthlies, quarterlies)

LOONEY TUNES

1941: 1-2 (#1 undated, bi-mo. for #2 only, dated Nov.)
1942: 3-14 (Mo., starting with Jan.)
1943: 15-26 (Mo.)
1944: 27-38 (Mo.)
1945: 39-50 (Mo.)
1946: 51-62 (Mo.)
1947: 63-74 (Mo.)
1948: 75-86 (Mo.)
1949: 87-98 (Mo.)
1950: 99-110 (Mo.)
1951: 111-122 (Mo.)
1952: 123-134 (Mo.)
1953: 135-146 (Mo.)
1954: 147-158 (Mo.)
1955: 159-170 (Mo.)
1956: 171-182 (Mo.)
1957: 183-194 (Mo.)
1958: 195-206 (Mo.)
1959: 207-218 (Mo.)
1960: 219-230 (Mo.)
1961: 231-242 (Mo.)
1962: 243-246 (Mo. through Jan., bi-mo. Feb.-Mar. and Apr.-May, quarterly, July-Sept.)

NOTES: (1) Title changes: Looney Tunes & Merrie Melodies Comics, 1-107; Looney Tunes & Merrie Melodies, 108-165; Looney Tunes, 166-246.

PORKY PIG

Four Color: 16, 48, 78, 112, 156, 182, 191, 226, 241, 260, 271, 277, 284, 295, 303, 311, 322, 330, 342, 351, 360, 370, 385, 399, 410, 426.

1952: 25 (Bi-mo, starting with Nov.-Dec.)
1953: 26-31 (Bi-mo.)
1954: 32-37 (Bi-mo.)
1955: 38-43 (Bi-mo.)
1956: 44-49 (Bi-mo.)
1957: 50-55 (Bi-mo.)
1958: 56-61 (Bi-mo.)
1959: 62-67 (Bi-mo.)
1960: 68-73 (Bi-mo.)
1961: 74-79 (Bi-mo.)
1962: 80-81 (Bi-mo. through Mar.-Apr.)

NOTES: (1) Bi-monthly publication within the Four Color series began with #342, July-Aug. 1951.
(2) Gold Key issues: see 10140.

BUGS BUNNY

Large Feature: 8.
Four Color: 33, 51, 88, 123, 142, 164, 187, 200, 217, 233, 250, 266, 274, 281, 289, 298, 307, 317, 327, 338, 347, 355, 366, 376, 393, 407, 420, 432.

1952: 28 (Bi-mo., starting with Dec.-Jan. 1953)
1953: 29-34 (Bi-mo.)
1954: 35-40 (Bi-mo.)
1955: 41-46 (Bi-mo.)
1956: 47-52 (Bi-mo.)
1957: 53-58 (Bi-mo.)
1958: 59-64 (Bi-mo.)
1959: 65-70 (Bi-mo.)
1960: 71-76 (Bi-mo.)
1961: 77-82 (Bi-mo.)
1962: 83-85 (Bi-mo. through Apr.-May, quarterly, July-Sept.)

NOTES: (1) Bi-monthly publication within the Four Color series began with #347, Aug.-Sept. 1951.
(2) Gold Key issues: see 30000, 10070.

TWEETY AND SYLVESTER

Four Color: 406, 489, 524.

1954: 4-7 (Quarterly, starting with Mar.-May)
1955: 8-11 (Quarterly)
1956: 12-15 (Quarterly)
1957: 16-19 (Quarterly)
1958: 20-23 (Quarterly)
1959: 24-27 (Quarterly)
1960: 28-31 (Quarterly)
1961: 32-35 (Quarterly)
1962: 36-37 (Quarterly through June-Aug.)

NOTES: (1) Gold Key issues: see 10094.

DAFFY DUCK

Four Color: 457, 536, 615.

1956: 4-7 (Quarterly, starting with Jan.-Mar.)
1957: 8-11 (Quarterly)
1958: 12-15 (Quarterly)
1959: 16-19 (Quarterly)
1960: 20-23 (Quarterly)
1961: 24-27 (Quarterly)
1962: 28-30 (Quarterly through July-Sept.)

NOTES: (1) Title changes: Daffy, 457-17, Daffy Duck, 18-30.
(2) Gold Key issues: see 10029.

BEEP BEEP

Four Color: 918, 1008, 1046.

1960: 4-7 (Quarterly, starting with Feb.-Apr.)
1961: 8-11 (Quarterly)
1962: 12-13 (Quarterly through May-July)

NOTES: (1) Gold Key issues: see 10189.

B. Titles published only as one-shots

MARY JANE AND SNIFFLES

Four Color: 402, 474.

PETUNIA

Four Color: 463.

ELMER FUDD

Four Color: 470, 558, 628, 689, 725, 783, 841, 888, 938, 977, 1032, 1081, 1131, 1171, 1222, 1293.

BUGS BUNNY'S ALBUM

Four Color: 498, 585, 647, 724, 838.

NOTES: (1) Title changes: #838 is Bugs Bunny's Life Story Album.

BUGS BUNNY'S MERRY CHRISTMAS

Four Color: 1064.

SPEEDY GONZALES

Four Color: 1084.

C. Giants

BUGS BUNNY'S CHRISTMAS FUNNIES - No. 1 - No. 9, 1950-1958. Title changed to Bugs Bunny's Christmas Party for No. 7 only.

BUGS BUNNY'S VACATION FUNNIES - No. 1 - No. 9, 1951-1959.

BUGS BUNNY'S HALLOWEEN PARADE - No. 1 - No. 4, 1953-1956. Title changed to Bugs Bunny's Trick 'n' Treat Halloween Fun with No. 3.

BUGS BUNNY'S COUNTY FAIR - No. 1, 1957.

DELL ONE-SHOT GIANTS, 1959-1962

28. Bugs Bunny's Winter Fun (1960)
32. Bugs Bunny's Beach Party (1960)
46. Bugs Bunny's Beach Party (1961)

II. GOLD KEY COMICS

10029: DAFFY DUCK

1962: 31 - Dec.
1963: 32-35 - Mar., June, Sept., Dec.
1964: 36-39 - Mar., June, Sept., Dec.
1965: 40-43 - Mar., June, Sept., Dec.
1966: 44-47 - Mar., June, Sept., Dec.

10047: THE TASMANIAN DEVIL AND HIS TASTY FRIENDS

1963: 1 - (February)

10070: BUGS BUNNY

1963: 89-91 - June, Sept., Dec.
1964: 92-96 - Mar., May, July, Sept., Nov.
1965: 97-102 - Jan., Mar., May, July, Sept., Nov.
1966: 103-108 - Jan., Mar., May, July, Sept., Nov.

NOTES: (1) Successor to 30000, Bugs Bunny Showtime.

10094: TWEETY AND SYLVESTER

1963: 1 - (November)
1966: 2-4 - (February), Aug., Nov.

10140: PORKY PIG

1965: 1-4 - (January), (May), Aug., Nov.
1966: 5-9 - Mar., June, July, Sept., Nov.

10189: BEEP BEEP THE ROAD RUNNER

1966: 1 - (October)

30000: BUGS BUNNY SHOWTIME

1962: 86-87 - Oct., Dec.
1963: 88 - Mar.

NOTES: (1) Succeeded by 10070, Bugs Bunny.

30025: BUGS BUNNY AND PORKY PIG

1965: 1 - (September)

WANTED:

the following comic books, in very good or better condition, on the scale in the GUIDEBOOK TO COMICS FANDOM:

Walt Disney's Comics & Stories - 1-4, 6, 8-11, 17-19, 21, 24, 32.
Donald Duck - Dell Color 4, Four Color 29.
Mickey Mouse - Dell Color 16.
Dumbo - Dell Color 17.
Thumper Meets the Seven Dwarfs - Four Color 19.
Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs - Four Color 49.
Dell black-and-white Disney comic books - all.
Mickey Mouse Magazine - many issues needed.

Looney Tunes & Merrie Melodies - 4, 5, 20, 21, 24, 30, 31, 40.
Bugs Bunny - Large Feature 8, Four Color 33.

The Funnies, Super, Crackajack - any 1941-42 issues with Walter Lantz strips.
New Funnies - 66, 70, 78, 80, 86, 87, 90, 93, 98, 100, 101, 103, 109.
Andy Panda - Four Color 25.

Our Gang - 5, 6, 11, 27, 29.

Little Lulu - Four Color 97, Dell one-shots 139, 165.

Animal Comics - 3, 4, 13.
Camp Comics - 2.
Easter with Mother Goose - 185.
Fairy Tale Parade - 3, 4, 6, 8, Four Color 87.
Raggedy Ann & Andy - Four Color 23.
Santa Claus Funnies - 2.

Boys' and Girls' March of Comics (giveaway) - many issues needed, both the full-size pulp-cover issues and the half-size slick-cover issues.
"Peter Wheat" giveaways - most issues needed.
"Donald and Mickey" Firestone Christmas giveaway - 1949 issue needed (M/N replacement copies of all other issues except 1946 and 1948 needed).
Omar Super-Book of Comics - 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 13, 16, 18, 20-23, 25, 28, 30 on.

I ALSO NEED THE following comics in mint or near-mint condition only: Walt Disney's Comics 15, 27, 34; Looney Tunes 19, 38; Bugs Bunny Four Color 51; New Funnies 67, 99; Oswald the Rabbit 183; Our Gang 8, 10, 19, 40, 41, 49, 50; Animal Comics 8, 15, 28; Camp Comics 3; Raggedy Ann & Andy 3, 6-9, 11-18, 21-23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38; Santa Claus Funnies Four Color 91; Tiny Tots Comics (Dell, 1943) 1. (Most of these comics are needed as replacements.)

I ALSO NEED THE following comics in mint condition only: Walt Disney's Comics 40, 43, 58, 67, 74, 79, 92, 127, 142, 144-146, 148-153, 155-161, 163-166; Donald Duck 348, 356, 367, 394, 26; Uncle Scrooge 456, 495, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 16, 21, 25, 27-29; Looney Tunes 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 25, 33, 41, 57, 60, 65, 126, 130; Porky Pig 156, 342; Bugs Bunny 142, 233, 432; New Funnies 69, 89, 106, 107, 116, 120, 123, 126; Andy Panda 154; Woody Woodpecker 169, 288; Oswald the Rabbit Four Color 21, 225; Our Gang 1, 24, 39, 55; Little Lulu 158 (1947), 2, 5, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 41, 43-48, 50, 54, 56-58, 72, 77, 92, 110, 129, 138, 145, 172, 174; Tubby 5, 7-9, 11, 13, 16, 36, 39; Little Lulu Tubby Annual 2; Little Lulu on Vacation 1; Blythe 1072; Pogo Possum 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15; Pogo Parade 1; Animal Comics 1, 5, 11, 12; Fairy Tale Parade 104, 114, 121; Santa Claus Funnies 205. (Almost all these comics are needed as replacements.)